

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-26 are rejected in the current Office Action.

Claims 1-2, 5-15 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,725,297 to Askar et al (hereinafter “Askar”) in view of what Examiner asserts is well known in the art as evidenced by any of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,923 to Mermelstein et al, or U.S. Patent No. 5,905,873 to Hartmann et al., or JP41004087A to Leprince et al., or EP1117049A1 to Hofmann et al., or EP1555816A1 to Schwendowius. Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Askar as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,260,935 to Turner. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Askar as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Publication No. 2003/0217239 to Jeddeloh (hereinafter “Jeddeloh”).

Claims 6-13 and 19-26 have been canceled in this Response. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to patentable distinguish Applicants’ invention over the art of record.

Applicants’ invention relates to a system and method for managing data transactions between a first bus and a second bus. A first transaction conversion module is operably coupled to the first bus and is operable to receive transactions from the first bus and a first format and to convert those transactions into an internal format. An ordering rules logic module is operably coupled to the first transaction conversion module and is further operable to control issuing of transactions in accordance with a dependency relationship between the individual transactions. The ordering rules logic module generates validated transactions that are provided to a second conversion transaction module which is operably coupled to the second bus. Independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite that the validated transactions are issued by the ordering rules logic module “through a plurality of virtual channels using an inter-virtual channel arbiter and a plurality of intra-virtual channel arbiters.” This feature is not taught by Askar, nor by the other art of record.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 14, as amended, are patentably distinguished over Askar and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the

rejections of claims 1 and 14. Applicants further submit that all of the claims dependent on independent claims 1 and 14 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
January 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

*/Gary W. Hamilton/*

Gary W. Hamilton  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 31,834